

Because Harrison fails to teach switching between a broadcast mode and a conference mode, as specifically claimed in each of the Applicants' independent claims 1 and 7, the Applicants respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Harrison.

The Examiner rejects:

claims 4-6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Harrison in view of Kirk et al. (USP 6,175,842, hereinafter Kirk),

claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Harrison in view of Maples et al. (USP 6,167,433, hereinafter Maples), and

claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Harrison in view of Maples and Kirk.

In each of these rejections, the Examiner relies upon Harrison for teaching a switching between a broadcast mode and a conference mode. The Applicants respectfully traverses this rejection, based on the comments above regarding Harrison, and based on the following remarks.

Claims 4-6 and 8 specifically claim presenting a graphical representation of the broadcast information with the conference information. Harrison specifically teaches encoding the conference (chat) information in the blanking fields of a video broadcast, in order to concurrently present the chat information with the broadcast information. The Applicants respectfully maintain that Harrison's *concurrent* presentation of chat information with broadcast video is inconsistent with a presentation of a graphic representation of the broadcast video. Absent the Applicants' teaching of *switching between* broadcast and conference modes, the Applicants respectfully maintain that one of ordinary skill in the art would not arrive at the Applicants' claimed invention via a combination of Harrison and Kirk.

Independent claim 9, upon which claim 10 depends, specifically claims a client apparatus that selectively controls *switching between* making broadcasted content information available to a user and enabling the user to enter a real-time communication with another user. Neither Harrison, nor Maples, nor Kirk, individually or collectively,

teach or suggest *switching between* presenting broadcast information to a user and enabling the user to enter a broadcast mode.

Because Harrison neither teaches nor suggests *switching between* a broadcast mode and a conference mode, as specifically claimed in each of the Applicants' independent claims 1, 7, and 9, the Applicants respectfully requests the examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 4-6 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over any combination of Harrison, Maples, or Kirk.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the present application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. No. 41,508
804-493-0707

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

It is hereby certified that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being:
[] deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
[] transmitted by facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at 703-_____.

On _____ By _____